



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,828	10/06/2000	Edward J.A. Pope	POPE#6(CIP)	2676
7590	06/03/2004		EXAMINER	
W. Edward Johansen 11661 San Vicente Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90049			MOORE, MARGARET G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1712	

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Application No.</td><td style="padding: 2px;">Applicant(s)</td></tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">09/680,828</td><td style="padding: 2px;">POPE ET AL.</td></tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Examiner</td><td style="padding: 2px;">Art Unit</td></tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Margaret G. Moore</td><td style="padding: 2px;">1712</td></tr> </table>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	09/680,828	POPE ET AL.	Examiner	Art Unit	Margaret G. Moore	1712
Application No.	Applicant(s)								
09/680,828	POPE ET AL.								
Examiner	Art Unit								
Margaret G. Moore	1712								

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 49 to 103 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 49 to 103 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

1. Claims 49 to 103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 49, the phrase "of forming a photo-curable pre-ceramic polymer, poly(ethynyl)-carbosilane to silicon carbide ceramic" is unclear. This rejection was made in the previous office action. Applicants have amended the claim to include the phrase "to form a silicon carbide ceramic" but this lends further uncertainty to what is intended by this claim. The latter phrase states that a silicon carbide ceramic is formed but the preamble states that the process forms a pre-ceramic polymer. In addition to this, the specific phrase "poly(ethynyl)-carbosilane to silicon carbide ceramic" makes no sense.

The Examiner notes that this phrase, or a comparable phrase (such as "to boron carbide ceramic" in claim 57) is present in all of the claims (either directly or indirectly). As such, claims 50 to 103 are unclear as well.

In claim 50, "(condethe" is improper.

Claims 49 to 103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are:

- a. In claims 49 and 50, there is no ceramic forming step. The condensing step b. does not form a ceramic.
- b. In claims 52 to 56, 58 to 63, 65 to 70 and 72 to 103, the step "using" is not an active process step that carries any weight. It is unclear what "using" is and as such these claims omit the essential process step.

2. Applicant is advised that should claim 49 be found allowable, claims 50, 57, 64, and 71 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Note that the preamble in these claims may differ, but since the preambles are

unclear and since preambles generally carry no patentable weight, this fails to distinguish the claims from one another. Note that the process steps that define these claims, step a. and b. are the same. In the case of claim 50 the process step b. is essentially the same as that in claim 49 since condensing and polymerizing as used in these claims are essentially the same.

3. Applicant is advised that should claims 51 to 56 be found allowable, claims 58 to 63, 65 to 70 and 72 to 77 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

4. The instant claims are quite confusing and it is unclear what, exactly, is being claimed. Since there are no actual process steps in many of the claims, it appears that many of the claims are the same as or essential duplicates of others. Since it cannot be determined what is being claimed the claims cannot be examined for prior art purposes. This was noted in the previous office action. Applicants' amendment has either made the claims even more confusing (as in claim 49) or has failed to clarify what is intended to be claimed (as in the new claims). The newly added claims have avoided the objected phrase "a use of" but many of the claims essentially amount to "use" claims.

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double

patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 49 and 50 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,403,750. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of reasons of record. This rejection was noted in the previous office action.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Margaret G. Moore whose telephone number is 571-272-1090. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Wednesday and Friday, 10am to 4pm.

8. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1712

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Margaret C. Moore
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1712

mgm
5/30/04